

Meeting Notes

Public Workshop and CEQA Scoping Meeting
Los Peñasquitos Lagoon Sedimentation/Siltation TMDL
San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board
Tuesday, February 15, 2011
9:00 am-12:00 pm

Public Workshop

Presentation of problem, the TMDL process, and current project status -Cathryn

Question:

Will Regional Board tighten the Industrial Permit?

Answer:

Still under development. May request State Board to use Water Quality Based Effluent Limitations (WQBELs). Staff still needs to review available draft Industrial Permit to determine if enforcing existing (and future) requirements will be adequate.

CEQA Scoping Meeting

Discussion of discharger's use of the following possible actions (all actions are tentative; no one action has been set):

- 1) Sedimentation Basins
- 2) Bioswales
- 3) Stream Restoration
- 4) Lagoon Restoration
- 5) Maintenance of existing BMPs*
- 6) Slope stabilization
- 7) Enhanced vegetation
- 8) Permit enforcement
- 9) LID-new and existing developments
- 10) Public outreach and education
- 11) Culvert cleaning
- 12) Storm drain repair and replacement
- 13) Sand filters (low priority, high maintenance cost, not appropriate)
- 14) Fixing railroad berm

Comments:

-Will the environmental review process contain an alternatives analysis?

Response: Yes, will be included in the Staff Report

-When will the environmental analysis be available for review?

Response: In early April.

-What is the potential for improvements to hydromodification?

Discussion: Hydromodification is difficult because everyone is doing their own thing. Hydromodification requirements are only for new development.

-What is the problem; will the discussed measures actually improve conditions in the Lagoon? Freshwater flows and the railroad berm are both impacting the Lagoon.

Discussion: Technical Report and TMDL focuses on wet weather dischargers of sediment. Freshwater flows are a dry weather problem also affecting the Lagoon, but outside the scope of the TMDL. Freshwater flows may be addressed thru enforcement of dry weather prohibitions, issue will be prioritized against other water quality issues in the Region. Artesian wells exist in the area.

-Numeric target was established using reference condition in Lagoon's history, when water quality standards were assumed to be met. Previous approach involved relationship between sediment and its effects on reducing the tidal prism, altering the salt marsh. Regional Board staff at the time told the group that the previous approach was too complicated and to stick solely with the sedimentation issue.

-There is a need to balance the natural equilibrium of the Lagoon and the streams feeding the Lagoon.

Discussion: Assume that in the 1970s, the system was in balance. The difference between then and now is the reduction needed.

-The railroad berm in a sense creates two lagoons. Changing the crossings might improve exchange, would need a good model to even consider. Without changing the crossings, reducing sediment loads should result in equilibrium in the Lagoon.

-Is the expectation that these mitigation measures will be adequate to contain sediment in the critical condition ('92/'93 rainy season).

Discussion: Compliance will be determined on a long term basis, not based solely on a single storm event. Management practices will not necessarily be able to function in significant storm events, but will be effective for small and medium storm events.

-For implementation purposes, there are opportunities to integrate this sedimentation TMDL and the Bacti I TMDL. Can allow greater length of time for compliance. Management measures for bacteria align well with management measures for sedimentation, especially storm drain maintenance.

-Department of Fish and Game doesn't allow 1:1 mitigation of freshwater wetlands into salt marsh. It is okay, however, to restore area through reducing sediment contributions to area.

-How will point sources differentiate between their contribution and incoming sediment loads?

Discussion: Measure incoming and outgoing loads, difference is your contribution. Regional Board also considers discharger's actions in determining compliance. Regional Board is moving towards measuring compliance thru

Significant Environmental Impacts:

Aesthetics

Consider scenic highways, vistas, and parkways. View corridors do exist in the watershed.

Agriculture

Operators may have to implement BMPs, but farmland will not be converted. Less than or no impact.

Air Quality/Noise

Temporary impacts during construction.

Impacts from maintenance activities.

Sensitive receptors exist in the area

Mitigation measures include compliance with ARB emissions standards, compliance with existing programs. Site specific CEQA analysis will need to mitigate for the specific project.

Cultural Resources

Do exist in watershed. City of San Diego has digging restrictions. Mitigate on project level.

Geology

Dealing with highly erosive soils. Mitigate on project level.

Hydrology

Will be addressed in house

Land Use Planning

Special attention to habitat conservation plan in Los Peñasquitos canyon preserve

Mineral Resources

Consider sand mining in area

Population and Housing

There is a potential for replacing houses with sedimentation basin.

Public Services

May have impact on parks and police. Fencing BMPs in urbanized areas may need additional police protection.

Transportation

Consider trails and pedestrian pathways in canyon.

Utilities

Utilities are located in streets, which precludes installation of BMPs in streets. Program will result in construction of new wastewater treatment and storm water drainage facilities.